

REMARKS

The present amendment is submitted in an earnest effort to advance this case to issue without delay.

1. The specification has been amended to update the cross reference to the parent application and to make the change at page 5 required by the Examiner.


2. Claims 4, 6 and 11, which the Examiner has asserted are unsupported by the specification have been cancelled without prejudice to Applicants right to claim that subject matter in a continuation application since it is Applicant's view that incorporating the subject matter of these claims in the specification is permitted since these claims formed part of the original disclosure and are self understood.

3. The claims remaining in the case are 1, 3, 5, 7, 9. These claims have been amended to define the invention more sharply over the references of record and to be free from any ground of rejection under 35 USC 112 which may formerly have been applied.

4. The claims remaining in the case are deemed to distinguish patentably over Groves in view of Sato and Hock. The Examiner has detailed differences over Groves. They include, for example, the provision of a shutter between the crucible and the substrate. The Examiner asserts that that feature would have been obvious from Sato which has a shutter between a substrate and an electron beam. The shutter referred to in Sato is not, however, provided in conjunction with two electron guns as claim 1 requires nor is it provided for a rotational substrate holder, nor is it provided in conjunction with a rotational crucible. The point is simply that Sato, Groves, and Hock do show bits and pieces of an apparatus which can be used for coating in each of the three cases, but it is not the Groves apparatus with which Sato provides a shutter and it is not the Groves apparatus in which Hock employs alternating voltage bias. In other words, there is no motivation to combine Sato with Groves or Sato with Hock or Hock with Groves except for the fact that the claims of the present case have been dissected to enable the references to be applied to isolated features. As the specification points out, the now patented method of the invention is best practiced by the apparatus now claimed and there is nothing in the art now of record in the case and applied

by the Examiner which would motivate the ordinary skilled worker who does not have the benefit of the instant disclosure before him, to create in some obvious way the structure now set forth in claim 1 and the claims which depend therefrom. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7 and 9, therefore, are deemed to be allowable over the references applied and an early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
The Firm of Karl F. Ross P.C.



By: Herbert Dubno, Reg. No. 19,752
Attorney for Applicant

db-

DATED: February 18, 2005
5676 Riverdale Avenue Box 900
Bronx, NY 10471-0900
Cust. No.: 535
Tel: (718) 884-6600
Fax: (718) 601-1099